

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 1, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,430,761 (Brandorff et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner initially states that the support 103, seen in Figure 3, is essentially planar. As seen in Figure 1D, the support 103 is arcuate and extends between arms 62. When extending between the two arms 62, the support 103 extends below, in the form of a sling, and in the specification is referred to as loops 103 secured to a sling cloth 102. The support shown in Figure 3 is not substantially planar.

The Examiner also states that the support frame is attached to the side edge of the patient support 103. The patient support 103 is attached to the arms 62 through hooks 106. These hooks are spaced above the support by sling straps 104 and the support frame is not connected to the side edge of the support 103.

The Examiner refers to a pair of bases, 22, 27. However, as seen in Figure 1B, element 22 is a telescoping right leg fitting within right leg 27. Even when referring to element 24 on the left leg, the disclosure does not meet the claimed limitations.

In meeting the limitation of a pair of bases having a first position having a width smaller than the patient support and movable to a second position having a width greater than the patient support, the Examiner refers to Figure 8. There is no disclosure of Figure 8, which has an adjustable width base axis, that the left and right leg attached to the base have a width less than the width of a patient support.


The Examiner rejected claims 9-11 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 4,939,801 (Schaal et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,691,345 (Nanahara). The Examiner stated that Schaal et al. disclosed the invention as claimed except for a railing extending upwardly from the second edge, at least one L-shaped arm connected to the railing and pivotally connected to the bottom surface of the

support surface, the L-shaped arm including a first and second section pivotally connected together. The Examiner relied upon Nanahara for disclosing a railing 113 having L-shaped arms 108 connected to the bottom surface, having a first section 110 and a second section 111 pivotally connected to one another. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The L-shaped arms 108 of Nanahara are not connected to the bottom surface of the patient support, but rather, a side surface. As seen in Figure 1, identified as a side view, the bottom of the arm 108 is connected to the side by pivot point 109, so the arm moves in a vertical plane. In addition, the sections 110, 111 are not pivotally connected together. It is not understood how a first and second section pivotally connected together does not require relative motion between the two sections. The pivot point 115 is between the arm 108 and side rail proper 112. The two arms 110, 111 are rigidly connected together, not pivotally connected.

A one month extension of time accompanies this response. If any additional fees are due and owing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2455.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher J. McDonald
Reg. No. 41,533

September 23, 2005

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street
Suite 522, Crystal Center 2
Arlington, VA 22202
(703) 415-0100

Attorney's Docket: A-7014.CIP.AAF/bh